UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,983	03/07/2001	Bob Ebert	3524.PALM.PSI	5877

49637   7590   04/10/2007
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.
9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD
SUITE 810
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069

EXAMINER
ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/801,983	EBERT ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Ting Zhou	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 February 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 8-10</u> is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>6,7 and 11-27</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 5 February 2007 under 37 CFR

1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/801,983 is acceptable and a RCE has been

established. An action on the RCE follows.

2.   The amendments filed on 5 February 2007, submitted with the filing of the RCE have

been received and entered. Claims 1-27 as amended are pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are allowed.

4.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The present invention

teaches an attention manager for managing a plurality of outstanding attention requests from

applications. Independent claim 1 identifies the distinct feature of automatically displaying the

notification dialog on top an on-screen display that is generated by a second application that is

active and simultaneously deleting from memory one or more outstanding attention requests that

have been cleared and no longer need the user's attention. The closest prior art, Vong et al. U.S.

Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong") and Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416 (hereinafter

"Chari") teaches a portable electronic device that manages attention requests and notifications

from a plurality of applications. In the case of the Vong reference, Vong teaches receiving a first

attention request (call) from an alarm manager associated with a first application that is

associated with a first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user

(when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00

AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager

receives this attention request from the alarm manager) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44),

automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires

attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is

8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the

request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer

system) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19), automatically sending a first request for information to the

first application when the first record entry requires attention from the user, the information

associated with the first record entry (when the first record entry requires attention from a user,

or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from

the user, the interrupt manager sends this request to the first application, or the notification

manager to be executed) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), creating a notification dialog for

displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in

the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first

record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the

calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how

the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the

user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box

displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), and automatically displaying the

notification dialog on top of an on-screen display that is generated by a second application that is

active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an

8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the

current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm

containing the notification information while other applications are running) (Vong: column 5,

lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30). In the case of the Chari reference,

Chari teaches the deletion of notifications (Chari: column 12, lines 10-28 and Figure 4A).

However, although Chari teaches the deletion of notifications, the user must select each

notification to be deleted, instead of deleting the notification simultaneously as the notification is

displayed; in other words, the prior art fail to teach determining if outstanding requests have not

been cleared, displays a list of them, and then facilitates *simultaneous* deletion of those requests.

Therefore, the prior art fail to anticipate or render the above limitations obvious. Claims 2-5 and

8-10 are dependent upon claim 1 and are allowable for similar reasons.

5.   Claims 6-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35

U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

6.   Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 6-7, 21-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "said electronic handheld device" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 7 is dependent upon claim 6 and is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "said electronic device" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 22 is dependent upon claim 21 and is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "said electronic handheld device" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 24 is dependent upon claim 23 and is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "said electronic device" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are . such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al.

U.S. Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong") and Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416 (hereinafter

"Chari").

Referring to claim 11, Vong teaches a method of notification that alerts users of an event

(Vong: column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method is

capable of receiving multiple attention requests from multiple applications (attention manager

handles multiple notification requests from multiple applications) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19)

including a first attention request from a first application that is associated with a first record

entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry

requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar

application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this attention

request from the alarm manager) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first

attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when

the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm

for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification

manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19),

determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests wherein each are associated with a

corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of the outstanding attention

requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding attention requests

including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention

requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the

first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the

user) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33), automatically sending a first request for

information to the first application, the information being associated with the first record entry

and is dependent on the number of outstanding attention requests being managed (a plurality of

alarms can be set for 8:00AM and therefore, when the hardware clock determines that it is

8:00AM, the alarm manager can send a plurality of notifications to the notification manager)

(Vong: column 7, lines 24-31 and column 8, lines 31-39), creating a first notification dialog for

displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in

the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first

record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the

calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how

the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the

user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box

displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), automatically displaying the first

notification dialog on top of an on-screen display associated with a second application that is

active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an

8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the

current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm

containing the notification information while other applications are running) (Vong: column 5,

lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30); and receiving a request to clear a

current attention request from the plurality of attention requests, the current attention request taken from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (clearing from the display, i.e. turning off, the current outstanding attention request, i.e. the displayed notification alarm, once the user acknowledges he is aware of the notification, via pressing the snooze button for example) (Vong: column 3, lines 65-67, column 7, lines 62-65 and column 8, lines 16-30). However, although Vong teaches the deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the notification alert (Vong: column 3, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65), Vong fails to explicitly teach deleting from memory any outstanding attention requests that has been cleared and no longer needs user's attention. Chari teaches a method and system for managing alerts similar to that of Vong. In addition, Chari further teaches the deletion of notifications (Chari: column 11, line 53 - column 12, line 28 and Figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include the ability to delete notifications, as taught by Chari. One would have been motivated to make such a combination to delete requests that are no longer active and in need of attention in order to conserve memory space, time and bandwidth, especially on a small-screen device such as a personal digital assistant or cellular phone.

Referring to claim 12, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a display request (notification request) to display a selected record entry associated with a selected attention request from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (request to display a notification alarm), automatically switching from the second application (user interface allowing users to schedule an event notification) to the third application associated with the selected record entry (notification

mechanism responsible for displaying scheduled notifications), displaying the attention request (turning on the LED or displaying the dialog box) and providing user interface with the selected record entry through the second application (Vong: column 2, lines 24-26 and 52-58, and column 5, lines 8-18 and 37-42).

Referring to claim 13, Vong, as modified, teach automatically launching the third application (the notification application is automatically activated upon the occurrence of an event) and automatically sending the display request to the third application (after the user schedules an event, the calendar application automatically calls the notification application with the request) (Vong: column 3, lines 60-65 and column 7, lines 14-30).

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a request from the user to clear an attention request (delete an alert) and deleting that alert from memory (ability to delete a plurality of alerts) (Chari: column 12, lines 13-20).

Referring to claim 16, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a request to suspend the plurality of outstanding attention requests, suspending each of the plurality of outstanding attention requests for a predetermined period of time (rescheduling the alarm for an additional five-minute period), reactivating the second application and displaying the plurality of outstanding attention requests after a predetermined period of time has elapsed in the second notification dialog (redisplaying the alarm after the five-minute snooze time has elapsed) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-30 and further illustrated in Figure 7).

Referring to claim 17, Vong, as modified, teach invoking (displaying) an alarm simultaneously with the display of the dialog box and the alarm taken from a group consisting essentially of an audible alarm (audio device), a visual alarm (light), a vibrator (vibration

device), a flashing LED and flashing the notification dialog (Vong: column 4, lines 4-15, column

6, lines 45-57 and column 8, lines 16-30).

Referring to claim 18, Vong teaches a system in an electronic device comprising a

processor, memory unit, display screen and a notification system that alerts users of an event

(Vong: column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this system is

capable of receiving multiple attention requests (attention manager handles multiple notification

requests from multiple applications) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19) including a first attention

request (call) from an alarm manager associated with a first application that is associated with a

first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record

entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the

calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this

attention request from the alarm manager) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing

the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user

(when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00

AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the

notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (Vong: column 5,

lines 8-19), automatically sending a first request for information to the first application when the

first record entry requires attention from the user, the information associated with the first record

entry (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the

8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the interrupt

manager sends this request to the first application, or the notification manager to be executed)

(Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), creating a notification dialog for displaying the information,

wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in the notification dialog when

the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires

attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application

requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how the user wants to be

notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be

notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box displaying alarm

information, as shown in Figure 7), and automatically displaying the notification dialog on top of

an on-screen display that is generated by a second application that is active (when the

notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM

attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the current

display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm containing

the notification information while other applications are running) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-17,

column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30). However, although Vong teaches the

deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the notification alert (Vong: column 3,

lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65), Vong fails to explicitly teach deleting from memory any

outstanding attention requests that has been cleared and no longer needs user's attention. Chari

teaches a method and system for managing alerts similar to that of Vong. In addition, Chari

further teaches the deletion of notifications (Chari: column 11, line 53 - column 12, line 28 and

Figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of

Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system

and method of Vong to include the ability to delete notifications, as taught by Chari. One would

have been motivated to make such a combination to delete requests that are no longer active and

in need of attention in order to conserve memory space, time and bandwidth, especially on a

small-screen device such as a personal digital assistant or cellular phone.

Referring to claim 19, Vong, as modified, disclose determining a plurality of outstanding

attention requests, each associated with a corresponding record entry and a corresponding

application, each of outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from the user, the

plurality of outstanding requests including the first attention request (ability to determine and

handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the

user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still

requiring attention from the user) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33).

Referring to claim 20, Vong, as modified, teach deletion from memory each of the

plurality of outstanding attention requests that have been cleared and no longer need user's

attention (Chari: column 12, lines 10-28 and Figure 4A).

Referring to claims 21-22, Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to request and view

information regarding the attention requests in a list format. As can be seen from Figure 6, Chari

shows the display of a log window containing the list of alerts that are still active. Therefore, if

there are active attention requests, they can be determined and displayed on a display screen via

a notification dialog that contains a list of these alerts, as recited in column 7, lines 37-46.

Having the teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and

method of Vong to include the list format display of active notifications, as taught by Chari. It

would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow the users to view

and keep track of all active notification alerts together in a log file.

Referring to claims 23-26, while Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to request and

view the attention request information in detailed format and the singular display of the details of

the attention requests. As can be seen in Figure 5, Chari shows the display of one detailed

notification dialog (alert screen) that contains all the details regarding the alert, i.e., the date,

time, and description of the alert. Therefore, this shows detailed information regarding a

notification can be gathered and singularly displayed on the screen as a detailed notification

dialog. It would then have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the detailed

format of display for the alerts can be requested whether the plurality of attention requests

contain every request except the first attention request, as is the case in claims 6, 7, 23 and 24, or

only the first attention request, as is the case in claims 8, 9, 25 and 26. Having the teachings of

Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include .

the singular display of detailed notification dialogs, as taught by Chari. It would have been

advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow users to view all the details related to

an alert in a single window display.

Referring to claim 27, Vong, as modified, teach a method and system in which the

electronic device is a palm sized computer system (portable handheld computing device) (Vong:

column 1, lines 63-64).

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive:

10.   The applicant argues that in Chari, the user must select each one of the notifications and click on a button that activates the deletion, whereas the present invention determines if outstanding requests have not been cleared, displays a list of them, and then facilitates simultaneous deletion of those requests. However, the examiner respectfully notes that independent claims 11 and 18 do not contain a limitation stating that the attention requests that have been cleared are deleted *simultaneously* upon display of the notification requests; in other words, the claims do not exclude the deletion of notification requests by user selection. Vong teaches that attention requests can be deactivated so that it no longer needs the user's attention (Vong: column 3, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65); Chari further teaches that attention requests can be deleted from memory. Therefore, the examiner respectfully maintains that the combination of Vong and Chari teaches the deletion from memory of one or more outstanding attention requests that have been cleared and no longer requires the user's attention.

11.   The applicant further argues that the combination of Vong and Chari is improper and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as neither reference explicitly recites the motivation to combine the references as suggested. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, both Vong and Chari teach an interface for managing and displaying alerts to

the user. Chari states that prior art systems for displaying alerts take up and waste valuable time

and bandwidth, as recited in column 2, lines 39-63; Chari also states that by displaying every

alert, the server manager is taking up valuable bandwidth on the network, increasing the amount

of traffic already on the network and decreases the performance of each computer, in column 2,

lines 57-65. Furthermore, Chari states that a major goal in the computer network industry today

is to reduce the amount and size of traffic on the network (column 2, lines 62-63), which is the

goal Chari is trying to achieve. Therefore, Chari specifically provides the motivation of

achieving the goal of reducing the amount of traffic on the network and the desire to remedy

prior art deficiencies in order to conserve bandwidth and improve system processing time; Chari

teaches achieving this goal by selectively disabling and deleting items such as notifications

(column 3, lines 21-23 and column 12, lines 10-28). In addition, it is generally known to one

skilled in the art, that deletion of items from memory frees up space in memory storage and

therefore improves processing time. In view of the above arguments, the examiner maintains

that the invention achieved by combining the teachings of Vong and Chari (i.e. a notification

system that allows notifications to be deleted) would have been obvious at the time the invention

was made, in order to achieve a major goal in the computer industry, as explicitly stated by

Chari.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100